3rd Grade Math

Multiplication and Division	
I have read the above standards and think they are appropriate as written.	
Number	Percent
79	89.04%
I have read the above standards and offer the following comments.	
Number	Percent
15	15.96%

The Math Standard 3.OAA.3 says by using drawings but when tested the students could not draw because the test was done on computer. Many students have to draw to show their work.

3.OA.A3 My understanding is that multiplicative comparison word problems are to be taught in fourth grade. Some districts teach multiplicative comparison word problems in third grade because it is one the chart. I agree with teaching those situations in fourth grade. Equal groups, arrays, and area seem to be a big enough challenge for third grade. Please clarify this for us.

I think having our kids draw there answer is ridiculous. What is wrong with learning multiplication tables. If I go to a bank for a loan and the loan officer starts drawing pictures I will walk out.

Seriously. There is so much wordiness. This is a math problem. All of the extra words are just confusing for anyone. Interpret?! How about "What is 5 X 7?"

300A1 Drawing pictures does not teach quick recall of basic facts. 300A3 Drawing pictures does not teach critical thinking. 300A4 If students are taught their basic number facts the unknown number won't be unknown.

Too difficult. Too abstract.

Why Are THEY Drawing AND HSVING To Interpret. Math worked 25 years ago. Do it that way. My child cries over math!

By the time children are in third grade, they should no longer rely on drawings to solve math problems. They should be learning multiplication tables which in turn leads to solving percentage problems and division problems in a more efficient way.

Let's begin by accepting & acknowledging the cold truth that children at this age operate in the concrete and are not able to process in the abstract. There is plenty of time for the word problems. Let's also accept the fact that children MUST Learn their multiplication facts before they progress to division, long division, word problems etc. This certainly did NOT happen at Benton or any other place in Arkansas from what I hear from other people. The equation 5=x/3 is completely stupid for a 3rd grader to grasp. The ADE should know that.

5x7=35. This is what they need to know. It is frustrating and time consuming to write a sentence with three or four terms in it. They are third graders. Let them memorize the multiplication table before introducing terms and word problems with diagrams.

Practicing multiplication tables the old fashioned way should be integrated into this curriculum. As the parent of a third grader, I have seen the difficulties. Multiplication should be mastered prior to learning division as this would make that process easier. I spend a lot of time working with my kids on basics. These would be better taught in school than at home.

I believe all the standards are too wordy. The examples in all of the standards are more reader friendly.

I think the wording is too hard for 8 year old kids to understand. I have numerous complaints from parents not knowing how to help their kids because even they don't understand it.

The standards are student and teacher friendly.

Shares is confusing. Use group s instead.

Relationship Between Multiplication and Division

I have read the above standards and think they are appropriate as written.

Number	Percent
83	88.30%

I have read the above standards and offer the following comments.

Number	Percent
11	11.70%

The commutative property is also used as, example, 3 x 2 x 5= show ways to solve the above problem and the answer was (3 x 2) x 5.

Or, pay attention, 8 X 7= 56 Why are making more steps to find one answer?

30AB5 This is taking the long way around to teach something very simple. It's a waste of time and frustrating to students.

Too difficult.

Same as above.

This standard for the distributive property is completely developmentally inappropriate at this age and if you at the ADE are child education experts you should know this.

Frustrating

3rd Grade Math

3.OAB.5- Clarify that they should be able to apply these properties, but not necessarily name what they are. These property names should definitely be introduced and used by the teacher, but the students need experience with applying these properties before they can name them.

The distributive property part of this standard should be addressed in a higher grade.

The CCSS.MATH.CONTENT.3.OA.B.5 wording is too complex.

The standards are properly written but we would want to make sure the second grade teachers introduce multiplication for awareness.

Multiply and Divide within 100

I have read the above standards and think they are appropriate as written.

Number	Percent
84	89.36%

I have read the above standards and offer the following comments.

Number	Percent
10	10.64%

Students work on understanding the operation of addition and subtraction as well as fact strategies during Grades 1 AND 2 with knowing the addition facts by memory at the end of Grade 2. However, Grade 3 must develop an understanding of the operations of multiplication and division, develop strategies, and know all of the facts by memory in ONE year. This is a huge undertaking that forces many districts and teachers to begin drilling multiplication facts for memory before students have been given the opportunity to work through the learning progression (understand the operation, develop strategies, and then work on fluency). Many math leaders say that drilling for memory before students have been allowed to work through the learning progression will hinder those students from ever truly knowing the facts.

Clarify fluency……does that mean automaticity or be able to use a strategy?

30AC7 Again, learning of number facts is basic and can't be successfully taught by muddying the water.

Same as above

The teachers are NOT following this standard of making children learn their multiplication tables. We did it at home luckily for us & our children. Could it be they spent too much time prepping for the litany of standardized tests instead?

It is totally appropriate to start this standard in 3rd grade. Maybe clarification of the required strategies could be included.

Frustrating

3rd Grade Math

I do not find it realistic to expect all students to know all their one-digit facts by memory by the end of third grade. I have found that the majority of my students have fluent recall for their (0-5) x (0-5) facts but still need to use a problem-solving strategy for their x6 - x9 facts. They often use those strategies quickly (fluently?) but they do not have instant recall.

great...examples

Student should memorize facts in order to move forward.

Solve Problems Involving Four Operations

I have read the above standards and think they are appropriate as written.

Number	Percent
79	89.04%

I have read the above standards and offer the following comments.

Number	Percent
15	15.96%

3.OA.D.8 needs an example

(8) The committee questions the reasonableness of this expectation at this grade level.

3.OA.D.8 Two-step problems are a struggle for many third graders. I'm not sure they are all developmentally ready for complicated two-step problems. I think the two-step problems at this level should be classified as simple (limiting use of some of the more difficult story types).

While I understand what the standard is saying, I do not have a clue why a 3rd grader needs to know anytime you multiply a number by 4 it's even. Why? How does this change what they learn?

OA.8 needs to be broken up into separate standards.

These objectives could be stated simply to the benefit of both teachers and students.

Too difficult

Same as above

Take this standard out of third grade. It is too abstract for 8-9 yer olds

You are out of your mind if you believe children in 3rd grade should be writing equations which have them solving for "x". Hammer the basics - there is plenty of time to solve all sorts of algebraic equations after the 3rd grade.

3rd Grade Math

Frustrating

OAD.9- Please keep in mind that some students may be able to recognize arithmetic patterns, but they don't have the language skills to explain them.

Mastering the use of 4 properties with 2-step word problems in 3rd grade is not developmentally appropriate.

Two step word problems using multiplication and division is difficult for most 3rd graders.

I think the wording is too hard for 8 year old kids to understand. I have numerous complaints from parents not knowing how to help their kids because even they don't understand it.

Multi-Digit Arithmetic	
I have read the above standards and think they are appropriate as written.	
Number	Percent
84	89.36%
I have read the above standards and offer the following comments.	
Number	Percent
10	10.64%

3.NBT.A.2- fluently add and subtract within 1000 and to fluently multiply is too much to be responsible for.

3.NBT.A2 I strongly agree with the emphasis of K-3 computation on place value understanding and properties of operations. I hope to see this continue. I do not want to force students to use the standard recording system for multi-digit computation. The CCSS progression in this area aligns with Arkansas' meaningful work with Cognitively Guided Instruction. As educational leaders, we must follow the research. I understand that this isn't always popular with the uninformed public or some teachers who resist change, but our goal is what is best for the students. Research has fostered improvements in medicine, technology, transportation, etc. over the past 50 to 100 years. Most people are not resistant to those changes. Why would we continue to teach the way we taught 50 to 100 years ago when research helps us know more about how students learn?

These objectives could be stated simply to the benefit of teachers and students.

Same as above

They don't need to learn multiple strategies to solve double digit multiplication.

Students have to round to the nearest 10 with a three digit number. Rounding should be introduced to the 10 with a 2 digit number and to the nearest 100 with a 3 digit number. To the nearest 10 with a 3 digit is too difficult since this concept was just introduced in. 3rd

3rd Grade Math

The rounding standard needs to be tied into the estimating standards.

"

There needs to be another standard in third grade to reinforce place value understanding learned in second grade.

I think there needs to be a specific standard for place value understanding added in third grade. There is a gap from second to fourth grade on this skill.

Fractions as Numbers

I have read the above standards and think they are appropriate as written.

Number	Percent
77	81.91%

I have read the above standards and offer the following comments.

Number	Percent
17	18.09%

(3.NF) The committee feels that although the expectations of the fraction standards are appropriate for 3rd grade, some of the wording needs to be simplified for teachers. Also, would it relieve some of 4th grade's fraction burden to add simple addition and subtraction of fractions (with like denominators using models) to 3rd grade's expectations?

I think this is not all developmentally appropriate. I think a longer period needs to be sent on understanding and having a full grasp of fractions before moving to higher order thinking skills on this skill.

3.NF.A.3.B I think equivalent fractions at the third grade level should be based on visual models, the number line, and expressions for whole numbers. I think equivalent fractions without those supports should be fourth grade. The way this standard is written, the visual model is only referenced as an example that might be used in an explanation. This implies that the task would not have a support model provided.

These objectives are correct but stated in a very long-winded way.

Too difficult

Same as above

Fractions on a number line for 8-9 year olds is preposterous! Research tells us that children don't think abstractly until age 10!!

Nope. Delete this as well for 3rd grade.

Visual models need to be stressed on these so our kids have a strong physical concept of fractions before going on to 4th grade.

3rd Grade Math

"

I NEVER WANT TO SEE FRACTIONS ON A NUMBER LINE

Not developmentally appropriate because not vertically aligned to 2nd grade standards.

The language in the above standards needs to be written clearer. Fractions on a number line needs to be addressed in a higher grade.

I agree with the above standards, except I feel fractions should be taught more real-life situation. I know of very few jobs where they use number lines to find fractions.

There are way too many fraction standards for this grade. At this age students are just getting comfortable with whole number operations and it has taken 3 years to get them there. It is too much for students in one grade to go from only knowing how to write a fraction in word form to finding equivalence in and comparing fractions.

The wording is somewhat simplified but it is still too complex for 8 year old's to understand.

This expectation could be difficult if mastery of basics has not yet occurred.

Measurement and Estimation

I have read the above standards and think they are appropriate as written.

Number	Percent
81	86.17%

I have read the above standards and offer the following comments.

Number	Percent
13	13.83%

3.MD.A.1- Why do they have to represent the problem on a number line? This may or may not be the most efficient way for a student to solve the problem. The student should be able to choose whatever strategy is best for them to find the answer.

The committee feels that students need a better foundation for life skills such as counting money and telling time. Although telling time is specified in grades 1 and 2, could basic elapsed time be added to 2nd grade? The tasks of identifying coins, values, and counting money needs to be more precise and start before 2nd grade.

3.MD.A.1 would like to see elapsed time moved above the third grade level. This is so difficult for most students at this level. Teaching elapsed time requires a great amount of time for a concept that is not an emphasis for the grade level and many children are not developmentally ready to learn. If the decision is made to include elapsed time, please limit the duration to no more than an hour. 3.MD.A.2 I like that these word problems are limited to one-step problems.

3rd Grade Math

Same as above

They do not need to use drawings for this.

What? 3rd Grade? You must be kidding.

I would like to see the rounding standard- 3.NBT.a.1 tied to these estimating standards so kids have real world situations for rounding.

"

THIS WAS NEVER TAUGHT IN 3RD GRADE IF IT WERE TO BE THEN GREAT

3.MD.A.1 - Clarify a time range for intervals of time for the word problems. PARCC focused only on intervals no longer than 60 minutes. Is/should there be specific guidelines? 3.MD.A.2 - Measuring and estimating needs to be a separate standard from solving word problems. To solve the word problems does not require any actual measuring.

Does 3.MD.A.2 mean that they are doing conversions? If so, I think it should say that.

The elapsed time part of the objective in 3.MD.1 needs to be kept to smaller intervals. The number line doesn't need to be included.

In standard 3.MD.A.1, I would like clarification about "word problems involving addition and subtraction of time intervals in minutes". I have seen this interpreted to mean ANY time intervals, including across hours, i.e., elapsed time from 11:45 to 12:05. I have also seen this interpreted to mean only minutes within an hour, i.e., elapsed time from 11:45 to 11:57.

Data	
I have read the above standards and think they are appropriate as written.	
Number	Percent
85	90.43%
I have read the above standards and offer the following comments.	
Number	Percent
9	9.57%

Same as above

A ruler will suffice. They don't need to use line plots to learn this skill

No way. Not 3rd grade.

3rd Grade Math

"

3.MD.B.4 - This standard is very difficult for third graders. They have very small fraction understanding, so to measure by fractional lengths is difficult. Also, some students understand making a line plot, but they cannot measure correctly. If this standard stays intact, it could be separated into subparts - a, b.

Two step word problems are not developmentally appropriate with this standard.

3.MD.4 The horizontal scale only needs to be in whole and half numbers for third grade.

Do not measure fourth

Put more emphasize in this area.

Geometric Measurement	
I have read the above standards and think they are appropriate as written.	
Number	Percent
82	87.23%
I have read the above standards and offer the following comments.	
Number	Percent
12	12.77%

3.MD.C7.D Decomposing this is too much.

3.MD.C.7.D If you include finding the area of rectilinear figures, please provide clarification on the difficulty level and provide examples. I have seen tasks that are a challenge but within reach for third graders. However, I have seen tasks that are a challenge for most adults.

MDC.7.D is confusing and sounds very similar to 7.C

Too difficult

Same as above

Tiling is not necessary to know which shape is bigger. Measuring is more than adequate now and in the work world.

Md.c.7.c and d are not developmentally appropriate for 3rd graders

NONE of this is appropriate at their age. Please….give me a break. See above comments about concrete vs. abstract. I would go so far as to say that many elementary math teachers would have to read these many times before they understood what it was asking.

3rd Grade Math

The area standards need to be tied in with the multiplication standards so kids have real world situations for using these two strategies of multiplication.

"

3.MD.7c doesn't need to be in a higher grade.

If basics are not mastered, this is a difficult application.

Perimeter	
I have read the above standards and think they are appropriate as written.	
Number	Percent
90	95.74%
I have read the above standards and offer the following comments.	
Number	Percent
4	4.26%

Same as above

I'm not sure this can be accomplished in 3rd grade with them taking 4-6 standardized tests.

"

Seems more fitting for geometry to be placed in 4th grade.

Shapes and Their Attributes	
I have read the above standards and think they are appropriate as written.	
Number	Percent
88	93.62%
I have read the above standards and offer the following comments.	
Number	Percent
6	6.38%

3rd Grade Math

The committee feels that some attribute vocabulary accountability may need to be added at this level. If students are to categorize shapes, they may need geometric vocabulary such as parallel and perpendicular.

3.G.A.1 This has always been a hard standard to understand. To discuss the attributes and name various quadrilaterals you seem to have to understand concepts not taught until fourth grade (line segments, right angles, parallel and perpendicular lines). I don't think those concepts need to be moved to third grade. It takes all year to work on multiplication, division, area, fractions, addition, and subtraction. I agree that the Geometry piece should be small at this level. Please clarify the scope of this standard. Also, what about the definition of a trapezoid?

Same as above

I was just learning this in 10th grade. I graduated in 2003

3.G.A.1- Could be more specific. Provide the different categories

Seems more fitting for geometry to begin in 4th grade.